Talmudic Micropedia - Firstborn to His Mother — Bekhor le-imo

Zadoq ben Aahron

מיקרופדיה תלמודית:בכור לאמו

Talmudic Micropedia: Firstborn to his mother - Bekhor le-imo

Firstborn to his mother - Bekhor le-imo[1] - A male born first to his mother, for the obligation of his redemption from the priest

Table of Contents — *Tochen Inyanim*

1. **Firstborn — *Bekhor***
   - **1.1 Son — *Ben***
   - **1.2 Daughter — *Bat***
   - **1.3 Conceived while she was a gentile — *Nita'abrah k'shehayta Goyah***
   - **1.4 Secular woman who repented — *Chilonit shechazrah b'Teshuvah***
   - **1.5 One born after stillbirths — *HaBa achar Nefalim***
   - **1.6 One who miscarries in the form of an animal, wild beast, or bird — *HaMapelet k'min Behemah, Chayah, veOf***
   - **1.7 Emergence of his head — *Yetzi'at Rosho***
   - **1.8 One born dismembered — *HaYotze Mechutach***
   - **1.9 After a viable birth — *Le'achar Leidah Makhsheiranit***
   - **1.10 Cesarean birth [7] and the one after it — *Yotze Dofen [7] veHaBa Acharav***
   - **1.11 The firstborn dies — *Met haBekhor***
   - **1.12 Procedure for redeeming a deceased firstborn — *Seder Pidyon Bekhor Met***
   - **1.13 The firstborn falls ill — *Chalah haBekhor***
   - **1.14 Non-viable (Terefah) — *Terefah***
   - **1.15 Priests and Levites — *Kohanim veLevi'im***
   - **1.16 A priestess or Levite woman impregnated by an Israelite — *Kohenet o Levia sheNit'abrah miYisrael***
   - **1.17 A priestess or Levite woman impregnated by a gentile — *Kohenet o Levia sheNit'abrah miGoy***
   - **1.18 A defiled priestess impregnated by an Israelite — *Kohenet sheNitchallelah veNit'abrah miYisrael***
   - **1.19 An Israelite woman impregnated by a gentile — *Yisraelit sheNit'abrah miGoy***
   - **1.20 Disqualified firstborn — *Bekhor Chalal***
2. **Doubtful firstborn — *Safek Bekhor***
   - **2.1 Tumtum and androgynous — *Tumtum veAndroginos***
   - **2.2 Doubt if she gave birth while still a gentile — *Safek im Yaldah b'Goyut***
3. **Footnotes — *He'arot Shulayim***

Firstborn

Son

Firstborn whose father is obligated to redeem him from the priest (see entry Redemption of the Firstborn) is a male son who is the firstborn to his Israelite mother, even though he is not the firstborn to his father (Mishnah Bekhorot 46a; Rambam Bikkurim 11:1; Tur Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De'ah 305:1,17), as it is stated: "All that opens the womb is Mine" (Exodus 34:19) - thus the scripture depends on who is first to the womb (Rambam ibid; Tur Shulchan Aruch ibid).

Even if he had several wives, and he has a firstborn from each one, they are all firstborns obligated in redemption (Mishnah Bekhorot 48b, and Baraita Kiddushin 29b; Rambam there 21; Tur Shulchan Aruch there), as it is said: "All the firstborn of your sons you shall redeem" (there 20.

Gemara Kiddushin there).

Daughter

The daughter is not included in the obligation of redemption, as it is said: "All the firstborn of your sons you shall redeem" (there. Gemara there 29a).

Became pregnant when she was a gentile

Since it is stated: "The first issue of every womb among the children of Israel" (Exodus 13:2), therefore, any whose womb opening was among Israel, even though the conception was not among Israel, the offspring is a firstborn for redemption (Rambam there 13; Shulchan Aruch there 20), and therefore, a maidservant who was freed and a non-Jewish woman who converted while they were pregnant and gave birth - are obligated in redemption (Mishnah Bekhorot 46a; Rambam there; Tur Shulchan Aruch there), even though their conception was not in holiness, since they were born in holiness (Rambam there; Shulchan Aruch there).

A maidservant and a foreign woman who gave birth, and afterwards the maidservant was freed and the foreign woman converted and gave birth to another child, the Tannaim disagreed about them:

There are those who say that the offspring are exempt from redemption, as they are not the first to open the womb (Tanna Kamma in the Mishnah there, and Rashi s.v. Ovdat Kochavim), and so is the law (Rambam there 14; Tur Shulchan Aruch there 21).

And there are those who say that even these are first fruits to the priest (Rabbi Yossi HaGlili there), that “the first to open the womb in Israel” means until the womb is opened by an Israelite, that in Israel he is the first, even though previously the womb was already opened by another, since at that time she was not an Israelite (Rabbenu Gershom there, s.v. until it is opened).

Secular Woman Who Returned to Religion

One who miscarried a fetus after the formation of limbs while living a secular life, and afterwards repented, and married and bore a son - she is not obligated to reveal to her husband about the miscarriage, and others who know about it are also not obligated to reveal this to her husband.

The reason: suspicion of theft and the matter of a blessing not for necessity is overridden for the sake of domestic peace, and to prevent embarrassment due to human dignity (Responsa Maharshal G 65; Responsa Be’er Moshe (Stern) 8 237; Responsa Yabia Omer 8 YD 32)[2].

The One Who Comes After Stillborns

The one who comes after the stillborns, whether born alive or born dead (Explanation of the Gra YD 320:39; Responsa Panim Me’irot 1:7), since the stillborn has already exempted the womb, the one who comes after him is not a firstborn for redemption (Mishnah Bekhorot 46a, and Rashi s.v. “the one who comes after stillborns”; Rambam ibid. 14).

This is the rule: Any miscarriage for which its mother is impure due to childbirth (see entry “Yoledet”) - the one that comes after it is not a firstborn of the womb, and any miscarriage for which its mother is not impure due to childbirth - the one that comes after it is a firstborn of the womb (Rambam there).

And therefore:

One who miscarries a shapeless mass full of water, full of blood, full of colors, they are not considered as a child that exempts the womb, and the one that comes after them is a firstborn for the priest.

And the same law applies to one who miscarries something like fish and locusts, creeping and crawling things.

And the same law applies to one who miscarries on the fortieth day from conception (Mishnah there; Rambam there; Tur Shulchan Aruch there 23)[3].

And the same law applies to a woman who miscarried a fetus whose skull is sealed, since she is not impure due to childbirth (Responsa Chacham Tzvi 77, s.v. “And things that are not”).

But:

The one who miscarries a sandal - this is a piece of flesh in the shape of a sandal (Arukh, sandal; Rema there) - is considered as a complete offspring, and the one that comes after it is not a firstborn (Mishnah Bekhorot there; Tur Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De’ah there).

And the same law applies to one who expels a placenta (Mishnah there; Tur Shulchan Aruch there), that is, the sac in which the fetus is placed (see entry Placenta).

And one who miscarries a formed fetus (Mishnah there; Tur Shulchan Aruch there), meaning an actual skin of a fetus (Rashi there s.v. Shafir), and it has the form of a human (Rema there).

But any shapeless embryo whose limbs are not formed, does not exempt the one that follows it (Maharik 113; Rema there).

And if she miscarried after her pregnancy was already recognized, that is after three months of pregnancy, according to all opinions this fetus is considered as a miscarriage that had organ formation, and the one that comes after is exempt from redemption (Responsa Noda Biyhuda Tinyana YD 188; Responsa Chatam Sofer YD 299).

Even at this time, they rely on the forms of the miscarriages whose limbs are not formed, that they do not exempt from redemption the child that comes after them, even though we are not expert in the form of miscarriages regarding the impurity of childbirth, for they only said to be stringent in the prohibition of Niddah, but not to exempt from money (Maharik Shoresh 143; Rema YD 305:23; Maharit Algazi Bekhorot Chapter 8 end of letter 60).

Therefore, if they examined the content of the miscarriage, and there was no formation of flesh and membranes, this is not called a firstborn of the womb, and when she gives birth next time to a male child, his father is obligated to redeem

him with a blessing (Responsa Chaim Sha'al 2:17; Responsa Yabia Omer 6 Yoreh De'ah 26).

If there was doubt whether his limbs were formed – whether they did not check at all, or they checked and found content like flesh, and there was doubt whether there was formation of limbs or not – they disagreed about the matter:

There are those who hold that the woman is established on her presumption that her womb has not opened, and the miscarriage on the presumption that its limbs have not formed, and the one who comes after them is a firstborn for the priest (Maharik 143; Noda Biyhuda, Tinyana, YD 188; Sheilat Yavetz 1:49).

And there are those who disagree, because most who miscarry, miscarry a formed fetus (see Niddah 29a), and here there is a majority against a presumption, and one should not extract money and obligate in redemption (Chacham Tzvi 104; Shevut Yaakov I 83; Chatam Sofer YD 299).

In our time, when it is possible to ascertain the condition of the fetus in its mother's womb through an ultrasound device, and to check if there is organ formation, one can rely on this examination even before three months of pregnancy, and the one who follows is exempt from redemption (Rabbi Shlomo Zalman Auerbach, his words are brought in the book Otzar Pidyon HaBen, Chapter 1, note 19; Rabbi Shmuel Wosner, his words are brought in the book Pidyon HaBen Kehilchato, Chapter 2, note 38).

The one who miscarries like a type of animal, beast, and bird

The one who miscarries something like a domesticated animal, wild animal, or bird, the Tannaim disagreed:

There are those who say that the one who comes after him is not a firstborn for redemption (Rabbi Meir in Mishnah Bekhorot 46a).

And there are those who say that until it has the form of a human, it is not considered a firstborn of the womb, and the one that comes after it is a firstborn for redemption (Sages there, and Rashi s.v. until it has), and so is the law (Tur Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De'ah 305:22)

"From the form of a man" means that half the face resembles the form of a man (Tur Shulchan Aruch there), meaning the forehead and the eyebrows and the eyes and the jaws and the beard's eyebrows (Rambam Issurei Biah 10:8, based on Niddah 23b).

The emergence of his head

The emergence of the head of a fetus is considered as birth and exempts the womb, and therefore, if an eight-month-old fetus falls and he is alive, or a nine-month-old and even dead, whose head emerged and returned, and afterwards his brother is born, the second is not obligated in redemption, for the womb has already been exempted by the head of the first (Mishnah Bekhorot 46a, and Rashi s.v. “the one who comes after stillborns”; Gemara there b; Rambam Bikkurim 11:15; Tur Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De’ah 305:22)[4], and once his forehead emerges, this is the emergence of his head, and exempts the one who comes after him (Gemara there; Tur Shulchan Aruch there).

A son of eight months who died, that his head emerged, the early ones disagreed in his law:

There are those who say that he is not considered as born, and the one who comes after him is the one who opens the womb, and is obligated in redemption (Rashi Niddah 26a s.v. “Havya Leida,” according to Seder Taharot 194:23), and so is the law (Tur Shulchan Aruch there), and specifically when only his head emerged, such as when he retracted his head inward and his brother emerged, but if he emerged completely, even if he is an eight-month-old who died, he is considered as born (Dagul Merivavah there).

And there are those who say that in an eight-month-old there is no difference between living and dead, and when they said that an eight-month-old whose head emerged is considered born - even in an eight-month-old dead, so is the law (Tosafot Niddah 26a s.v. sandal, according to Seder Taharot there, and the explanation of the Gra YD 306:39).

The one who goes out from a cut

A child that emerged dismembered limb by limb, behold he is as born, and the one that comes after him is not a firstborn (Mishnah Bekhorot there; Rambam there 15; Tur Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De’ah 305:22).

In the emergence of the head in a cut, the Amoraim disagreed:

There are those who say that the head does not exempt in a case of a severed one, such as when she gave birth to twins, and the head of the stillborn emerged and they cut it, and his brother preceded and emerged before the other limbs of the severed one emerged (Rabbi Elazar in Niddah 29a).

And there are those who say that even in the case of a severed head, it exempts the one that comes after it from the birthright (Rabbi Yochanan there)[5].

Even in law, the early authorities disagreed: there are those who rule according to the first opinion (Rashi Bechorot 46a s.v. Machutach; Rambam Bikkurim 11:15, according to Mahari Kurkus there); and there are those who rule according to the second opinion (Rambam Issurei Biah 10:6, and Bikkurim there, and Tur Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De'ah 194:10, according to Maharit Algazi Bechorot 7:63).

After Instrumental Birth

A woman who had difficulty giving birth, and the doctors needed to widen the vaginal opening with scissors, in any case, the child is considered as the firstborn of the womb and is obligated in redemption (Responsa Har Tzvi Yoreh De'ah 248; Yalkut Yosef Sheva Brachot 2:21).

Firstborn of a human that was brought out from the womb with the help of forceps, this firstborn is obligated in redemption and in blessing (Responsa Tzafnat Paneach Siman 7; Responsa Maharash Engel 4; Responsa Dovav Mesharim 2:32; Responsa Igrot Moshe Yoreh De'ah 3:125, and others).

The reason: In our time, the extraction of the baby with forceps is done when the fetus is in the vagina, and therefore there is no separation at all between its head and the uterus or the cervix, but between its head and the vagina[6].

Infant who was taken out from his mother's womb with the help of a vacuum extractor, must be redeemed as usual and with a blessing (S' Otzar Pidyon HaBen, 1 note 46, in the name of contemporary halachic authorities; Yalkut Yosef Sheva Brachot there 22).

Exception[7]and what follows it

Emerging-through-the-side [a fetus that was brought out from its mother's womb through the side] (see its entry) and the one that comes after it, the Tannaim disagreed on the matter:

There are those who say that neither of them are firstborns for the redemption of the son (Tanna Kamma in Mishnah Bekhorot 47b), the first because he does not open the womb, and the second because he is not a firstborn for offspring, for there was a male offspring before him, even though he is a firstborn for the

wombs, for a firstborn for one matter is not a firstborn (Gemara there), and so is the law (Rambam Bekhorot 11:16, and Nachalot 2:11; Tur Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De'ah 305:24, and Choshen Mishpat 277:7).

And there are those who say that the second is a firstborn for redemption (Rabbi Shimon in the Mishnah there), that he is a firstborn for mercy, and a firstborn for one thing is a firstborn (Gemara there).

The one who was born by caesarean section fell – there are those who say that the one after him is obligated in the redemption of the firstborn (Novellae of Rabbi Akiva Eiger Yoreh De'ah Siman 305, on Taz there Se'if Katan 20; Responsa Har Tzvi Yoreh De'ah 249); and there are those who say that the second is exempt from the redemption of the firstborn (Maharsha Niddah 26a; Sidrei Taharah Yoreh De'ah Siman 194 Se'if Katan 27; Novellae of the Chiddushei HaRim on Yoreh De'ah 305:24; Responsa Minchat Yitzchak 4:50).

The Firstborn Died

The firstborn died within thirty days, the father is not obligated to redeem him (Mishnah Bekhorot 49a; Rambam there 17; Tur Shulchan Aruch there 12), for he is a miscarriage (Rashi there s.v. yachzir).

And even if he was killed within thirty days, for it can be said that he is not a miscarriage and if he was not killed he would have lived, in any case he is exempt from redeeming him, as it is said: "You shall surely redeem" (Numbers 18:15), and "surely" comes to exclude (see entry for "akhin" and "rakin").

Bava Kamma 11b, according to Rashi there s.v. "Firstborn that was torn").

Died on the thirtieth day, like one who died within thirty (Tanna Kamma in Mishnah Bekhorot 49a; Rambam there; Tur Shulchan Aruch there).

Died after thirty days, the father is obligated to redeem him (Mishnah Bekhorot 49a; Rambam there 17; Tur and Rema there 12)[8].

Order of Redemption of the Firstborn Donkey

In the beginning, one must redeem the firstborn who has died before the burial, but if they have already buried him, the father is not exempt from the obligation of redemption (Responsa of Radbaz manuscript section 187).

When redeeming a firstborn after his death, the father should bless “on the redemption of the firstborn of Israel” (Meiri Pesachim 121b), and should not bless “on the redemption of the son,” or “on the redemption of the firstborn,” as this language implies that the firstborn is still alive (Meiri ibid.; Maharik Shoresh 49 letter 2; Rema YD 305:12).

And see Shach there S.K. 17).

And regarding the blessing of Shehecheyanu - there are those who say that he should bless (Yam Shel Shlomo Kiddushin 1:54, in the name of the Ran); there are those who were uncertain if he should bless (Tosafot Bekhorot 49a s.v. Le’achar; Rosh Bekhorot there); and there are those who decided that he should not bless (Rema there).

Father who redeems the firstborn deceased says to the priest: “My firstborn son whom my wife bore to me died and left life to all Israel, here are five selaim that I am obligated to give to the priest for his redemption” (Order of Redemption of the Firstborn by Maharil, in glosses and additions there), and the priest takes the redemption money, and says: “This money is for the redemption of your firstborn son who is in the grave,” and blesses the father (and not the son), and says that God will bless him and fulfill in him verses of blessing (see Meiri Pesachim 121b).

Challah the Firstborn

Fell ill within thirty, even though they estimated him for death, since he lived after thirty, he is obligated in redemption, and even if he was dying[9] and going out to be executed[10] (Yam Shel Shlomo Bava Kamma 1:30; Birat Migdal Oz Berakhot Hori Peleg 3, letter 22)[11].

Infant firstborn who became ill, and therefore his circumcision was postponed, and he recovered on the thirty-first day of his life, needs to perform the circumcision first, and afterwards redeem him on that day (Shach YD 266:12; Birkei Yosef YD 262:3; Chochmat Adam 150:10; Responsa Chatam Sofer YD 308).

But if he did not recover even on the thirty-first day, they redeem in its time, and they will perform the circumcision when he recovers, and there is no need to delay the redemption until he is fit for circumcision, for the redemption is not dependent on the commandment of circumcision, and a commandment that comes to your hand do not let it sour (Responsa Bach Chadashot 50; Responsa Devar Shmuel (Abohab) Siman 160; Pachad Yitzchak, entry Circumcision Precedes Redemption; Responsa Chatam Sofer there).

Father who left his infant when he is ill, can redeem him not in his presence on the assumption that he is alive (Chazon Ish YD 186).

Terefah

If it became a tereifah within thirty days, it is exempt from redemption (Gemara there, according to Tosafot s.v. Bechor, in the name of Rabbeinu Tam; Rambam there; Tur Shulchan Aruch there), even if it lived afterward for a long time (Shach there, subparagraph 16; Chochmat Adam 150:11), as it is said: “However, you shall surely redeem” (there), and “however” comes to exclude (Gemara there, according to Tosafot there), and even in the case of a doubtful tereifah, it is exempt from redemption, as the burden of proof is on the claimant (Shach there) [12].

And there are those who say that the law of the redemption of the firstborn is not dependent on the definition of a tereifah but on the question of whether it can live, and since in our days it is possible to treat many tereifah conditions, if they treated him and he lived – he must be redeemed with a blessing (Yad Shaul Yoreh De’ah Siman 305 on the Shach there; Siddur Beit Yaakov Hilchot Pidyon Bechor Ot Vav; Responsa Tzitz Eliezer 16:32).

Priests and Levites

Firstborns who are priests or Levites are exempt from redemption, by a fortiori reasoning: if their Levitical sanctity exempted the sanctity of the firstborns of Israel in the wilderness, as explained in the Torah (Numbers 3:41), it is logical that it would nullify their own sanctity (Bekhorot 4:1; Rambam there 9; Tur Shulchan Aruch there 18)[13].

A priestess and a Levite woman who became pregnant from an Israelite

A priestess or a Levite who became pregnant from an Israelite and gave birth to a firstborn, the Amoraim disagreed about their law:

There are those who say he is obligated in redemption, for the offspring is related to the father’s family who is Israel (Rav Pappa in Bekhorot 47a).

And there are those who say that he is exempt from redemption, for the Torah made the law of redemption dependent on the one who opens the womb (Mar the son of Rav Yosef in the name of Rava there), and therefore the matter does not depend on the father but on the mother (Rambam there 10), and so is the law (so it appears in Chullin 132a; Hilchot Bechorot by Ramban there; Rambam there; Tur Shulchan Aruch there).

A priestess and a Levite woman who became pregnant from a non-Jew

Translated Text:

Were impregnated by the non-Jew, the son of the Levite woman is exempt from redemption, and the son of the priestess is obligated, for the Levite woman is not disqualified from her sanctity by the intercourse with the non-Jew (see entry Levite), and the priestess is profaned from her sanctity when she has intercourse with the non-Jew (see entry Chalal).

Bechorot there; Rambam there; Tur Shulchan Aruch there), and the obligation is on the son himself when he grows up (Shach there subparagraph 22).

A priestess who was desecrated and became pregnant from an Israelite

A priestess who was desecrated by the intercourse of a non-Jew, and afterwards became pregnant from an Israelite, the father is obligated in the redemption of the son (Shach there).

An Israelite woman who became pregnant from a non-Jew

A daughter of Israel who became pregnant from a non-Jew, if the child is a firstborn, he is obligated in redemption (Tur there), all the more so from a priestess who became pregnant from a non-Jew (Bach there), and the obligation is on the son himself when he grows up (so it implies in Shach there, subparagraph 23).

Firstborn of a Defiled

A priest to whom a firstborn non-priest was born, he is like an Israelite and obligated in the redemption of the firstborn, but the father merits his redemption, and therefore if the father dies after thirty days, the son is not obligated to redeem himself, for his father has already merited his redemption (Bekhorot 47b; Rambam there 12; Tur Shulchan Aruch there 19), and the son, when he inherits his father's assets, also inherits this right, and just as the father would set aside the redemption and take it for himself, for he is a priest, so too the son sets it aside and takes it for himself (Rashi there s.v. for; Rosh there 7:3; Tur Shulchan Aruch there), for the priest is exempt from redemption only due to his sanctity, and the non-priest, who lacks priestly sanctity, his entire exemption is due to the father's merit in his redemption, and therefore he must set it aside so that he may merit it afterward (Biur HaGra there S.K. 35)[14].

Indeed, if the father died within thirty days, the Amoraim disagreed about his ruling:

There are those who say that the son is obligated to redeem himself, for the father did not merit his redemption, as his father was never obligated, but rather the son became obligated after his father's death, and he must give it to another priest (Rabbi Shimon ben Yassina in the name of Reish Lakish and Rav Chisda there, and Rashi s.v. "the father did not merit"), and so is the law (Rambam there; Tur Shulchan Aruch there).

And there are those who say that the son is not obligated to redeem himself, as he can say to the priest, I come from the power of a person with whom you cannot litigate, for if my father were alive, he would take the redemption for himself (Rabba bar Rav Huna there, and Rashi s.v. that he said to him).

Doubtful Firstborn

Whoever is doubtful if he is obligated in redemption, behold he is exempt, for the burden of proof is on the claimant (Rambam Bikkurim 11:19), and therefore:

Whoever his wife did not give birth first and she bore a male and a female, and it is not known which of them came out first, there is nothing here for the priest (Mishnah Bekhorot 48a; Rambam there 20; Tur Shulchan Aruch Yoreh De'ah 305:25), perhaps the female came out first (Rashi there s.v. there is nothing here).

If she gave birth to two males, and it is not known which of them is the firstborn, and one of them died within thirty days, he is exempt from redemption, lest the firstborn is the one who died; but if both are alive, he is obligated to redeem one of them from the priest (Mishnah there; Rambam there; Tur Shulchan Aruch there), even though it is not known which of them is the firstborn (Rambam and Tur Shulchan Aruch there).

Tumtum and Androgynous

The tumtum is exempt from redemption, because he is a doubtful male (Minchat Chinuch 292:4), and in the androgynous, the matter depends on the different opinions regarding his essence (see entry Androgynous. Minchat Chinuch there).

Doubt if she gave birth in gentile status

A non-Jewish woman who converted and gave birth, and it is not known if she gave birth before she converted or after she converted, this is a doubt, and the burden of proof is on the one who seeks to extract from his fellow (Chullin 134b; Rambam there 13; Tur Shulchan Aruch there 20)[15].

Footnotes

1. ↑ 3, Firstborn of Man, p. 2771-2811.
2. ↑ And there are those who disagree (Rabbi Yosef Shalom Elyashiv, Moriyah, Elul 5758, Issue 1-2 (253-4).
3. ↑ And see Responsa Kol Mevaser 2: that if there is doubt whether he was born on the fortieth day or slightly after, he should redeem the one after him, but not bless with name and kingdom.
4. ↑ There are Amoraim who hold that the head does not exempt in miscarriages, that an eight-month-old living who only brought out his head and retracted it and his brother preceded him, the second is a firstborn to the priest, as it is said: “All in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life” (Genesis 7:22) - one who is a living being follows his nostrils, meaning his head, and not when he is not viable, unless most of him emerged

(Samuel in Bekhorot 46b, and Rashi s.v. “the head does not”, and s.v. “spirit of life”), and there are Rishonim who explained that even Tannaim disagreed on this (Tosafot there s.v. “refutation” and Niddah 29a s.v. “implies”, in the name of Rabbeinu Chananel).

5. ↑ And there are Amoraim who hold that the Tannaim dispute this matter (Rav Pappa there; Rav Zevid there, according to Rashi s.v. “but said”).
6. ↑ There are Acharonim who ruled that this is a doubtful firstborn, and exempt from the redemption of the firstborn, because they thought there is an interposition between the head and the womb (Responsa Helkat Yoav 1 YD 26; Responsa Avnei Nezer YD Siman 391-394, and others). In contrast, there are those who ruled that in the firstborn of man there is no law of interposition at all, and therefore he is obligated in any case in the redemption of the firstborn (Responsa Igrot Moshe there; Responsa Teshuvot VeHanhagot 1 Siman 665, and there in the name of the Gaon of Brisk and the Gaon of Tchebin).
7. ↑ Cesarean section.
8. ↑ And see Responsa Rabbi Akiva Eiger Tinyana 22 regarding the calculation of time.
9. ↑ In the novellae of Rabbi Akiva Eiger YD 375 he was uncertain about a person dying at the hands of man.
10. ↑ In Responsa Shevut Yaakov 2:82 he distinguished between one going to be executed by Jewish law, and one going to be executed by non-Jewish law.
11. ↑ In Responsa Elef Lecha Shlomo YD 285, and Responsa Mahari’a Halevi 1:38 they disagreed and wrote that he is exempt from redemption, and they should redeem him without a blessing, and as a gift on condition to return.
12. ↑ There are Rishonim who hold that only one who became a treifah after birth is exempt from redemption, but one who was born a treifah from the beginning of his formation is obligated in redemption (Meiri there, in the name of our great predecessors).
13. ↑ And there are Acharonim who explain that the a fortiori argument was only stated regarding Levites, but priests are exempt anyway since their redemption (Haamek She’elah 118:4).
14. ↑ And there are those who hold that he does not need to separate the redemption at all (so it implies in Tosafot there s.v. “the son”, and in Maharit Algazi there 47, in the name of Tosafot Chitzonot), that separation is not relevant in the redemption of the firstborn, for as long as it is not given to the priest, the redemption does not exempt anything and he is still liable for it (Maharit Algazi there).
15. ↑ In all these doubts, if one of the priests seized the redemption money, whether it is taken from his hand, see the entry on monetary doubt, and the entry on seizure, and the entry on the redemption of the firstborn.

---

https://www.yeshiva.org.il/wiki/index.php/%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%A7%D7%A8%D7%95%D7%A4%D7%93%D7%99%D7%94_%D7%AA%D7%9C%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%93%D7%99%D7%AA:%D7%91%D7%9B%D7%95%D7%A8_%D7%9C%D7%90%D7%9E%D7%95